

ADVISORY BOARD ON TEACHER EDUCATION AND LICENSURE (ABTEL) MEETING

MINUTES

November 19, 2001

The Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure met for a regular business meeting at The Cultural Arts Center at Glen Allen, Glen Allen, Virginia, with the following advisory board members present:

Sharon Condrey
Ron Diss
Judy Davis-Dorsey
Brenda Duda
Ken Fleming
Jill Fox

Mark Glaser
Margaret Shibley Gray
Holly Hawthorne
Kimberly Loy
Mary McCauley
Jane Massey-Wilson

Nancy Miller
Cheryl Lightfoot
Donna Smith
J. David Smith
Susan Walton

Absent:

Mychele Brickner

Dale Sander

Board of Education Liaison:

Susan T. Noble

Ex-Officio Member:

Carole Ballard

Department of Education:

Thomas A. Elliott
Alice Bryant
Pat Burgess
JoAnne Y. Carver

Paul Joseph
Byrd Latham
Winston Odom
Patty Pitts

Guests:

Scott Goodman
James Heywood

Betty Lambdin

FULL BOARD MEETING

Dr. Jane Massey-Wilson, chair of the Board presided. The meeting was called to order at 10:05 a.m. with the Pledge of Allegiance.

INTRODUCTIONS

Dr. Jane Massey-Wilson introduced Board of Education member, Scott Goodman, and the new advisory board member, Cheryl Lightfoot. Ms. Lightfoot is a teacher at Thomas Jefferson Elementary School in Louisa County.

To support new advisory board members, Dr. Massey-Wilson, appointed Brenda Duda to mentor Ms. Lightfoot and Holly Hawthorne to mentor Dale Sander, division superintendent, Fredericksburg City Public Schools.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Holly Hawthorne made a motion to approve the agenda as presented. Ms. Donna Smith seconded the motion, and the motion was unanimously approved.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Brenda Duda made a motion to approve the minutes of the September 17, 2001, advisory board meeting. Ms. Susan Walton seconded the motion, and the motion was approved unanimously.

A suggestion was made to post a draft copy of the minutes of the advisory board meetings on the Virginia Department of Education Web site immediately following the meetings. Dr. Elliott indicated that a draft copy of the minutes would be posted with a special note that the minutes have not been approved by the advisory board.

AGENDA ITEMS

Agenda Item A:

A Report on House Joint Resolution Number 794 Requesting the Department of Education, in Cooperation with the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia, to Study the Proficiency of Virginia Teachers in Teaching Systematic Explicit Phonics and the Availability in Local School Divisions of Decodable Textbooks and Other Suitable Materials for Systematic Phonics Instruction

Dr. JoAnne Carver and Dr. James Heywood presented. Dr. Carver provided an over-view of the draft report including highlights of the Department of Education's work plan, findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the report. The report

addressed five critical issues in response to House Joint Resolution Number 794. The Division of Teacher Education and Licensure was responsible for addressing the first three issues and the Division of Instruction addressed issues four and five.

The five critical issues were as follows:

- 1) Extent to which teacher preparation programs in Virginia's schools of education provide instruction to aspiring teachers in the use of systematic explicit phonics;
- 2) Usefulness of requiring that all persons seeking initial licensure or licensure renewal demonstrate proficiency in the teaching of systematic explicit phonics;
- 3) Creation of a state professional development program to assess the skills of those teachers required to demonstrate phonics proficiency for licensure and providing additional training in systematic explicit phonics to those who do not demonstrate such proficiency;
- 4) Availability in local school divisions of decodable textbooks and other suitable materials for systematic phonics instruction; and
- 5) Recommendations for establishing statewide standards of decodability for the textbooks used in Virginia's schools for phonics-based instruction.

The Senate, House, and members of the General Assembly became concerned about the scores on core sections of the 2000 Standards of Learning tests. The General Assembly looked generically at pass rates of school divisions in which the students had not passed the English test (61% of 132 school divisions in 2000) and decided that it was a level that caused concern. The conclusion was drawn that children were typically scoring low because of a lack of instruction in systematic explicit phonics instruction.

Advisory board members can review the report and to e-mail any concerns they have to Dr. Carver on or before November 26. As requested in the resolution, the report will then be transmitted by the State Superintendent to the Governor and the General Assembly. Ms. Noble suggested that the report be as brief and concise as possible with the understanding that a more detailed report is available for those who request additional information.

Dr. Heywood indicated that the real issue is how phonics is taught and the definition of systematic explicit phonics instruction. He believes people confuse the words systematic and synthetic. The generalists that are trying to follow the National Reading Panel report use the term explicit phonics. They fail to understand that synthetic phonics, which is a part of systematic explicit phonics, takes the 44 sounds in isolation and teaches them in 44 separate sounds and blends them.

Dr. Heywood conducted a survey of institutions of higher education two years ago to identify institutions that could provide assistance in in-service training for teachers in synthetic phonics. Only one college responded that they provided instruction in synthetic phonics. Dr. Heywood stated that teachers need a repertoire of skills to teach all children, including analytic and synthetic phonics.

There are probably 10 different kinds of phonics, but they typically break down into synthetic and analytical. Decodable text is needed for synthetic phonics, but not analytical phonics. Decodable text cannot be a stand-alone program. Decodable text has to match the sequence that the reading program uses. Dr. Heywood said that to answer the question of what should be the standards for decodable text, we should look at the research completed by the state of Texas. As indicated in the report, 80 percent decodability means that if there are 100 words in a book, 80 percent of them are words that are either sight words or words that have been taught or the sounds have been taught at that point in time.

It is very important that people clearly understand explicit phonics has two major components that are really quite different. The National Reading Panel report is very clear that you need the synthetic version because it is not based on context, the child's literacy experiences, or on using other words to help decode the target word. Individuals can be taught the 44 sounds no matter what their literacy background.

Dr. Jill Fox offered the following two inserts in the conclusions for consideration:

- A) Reading coordinators and faculty who teach reading in Virginia's 37 approved teacher preparation programs report that they currently include systematic explicit phonics indicating that this was a self-reporting mechanism rather than an objective assessment by an outside person.
- B) There is a need for some type of assessment in Virginia through which teachers could demonstrate phonics proficiency as well as a repertoire of other reading strategies for licensure.

Ron Diss made a motion to support the HJR 794 report with the proposed changes to Conclusion A and C and a suggestion that the report format for the General Assembly be condensed. Ms. Holly Hawthorne seconded the motion, and the motion carried unanimously.

Agenda Item B:

A Report on Virginia's Professional Teacher's Assessment and Its Impact on Provisional Licensure

Mrs. Patty Pitts presented the Report on Virginia's Professional Teacher's Assessment and Its Impact on Provisional Licensure. At the September 17, 2001, advisory board meeting, advisory board members requested that staff prepare a report that would address the impact of reducing the time to allow individuals to meet the professional teacher's assessment requirement. The advisory board members requested the report to determine whether they wanted to pursue this topic as an initiative for the year. Currently, individuals are allowed three years to meet the Praxis requirements under the provisional license.

As requested, staff in the Division of Teacher Education and Licensure prepared the report, including impact of policy changes. Advisory board members stated that the report was thorough and provided valuable information. Dr. Elliott noted that the report will be available to the public by contacting the Department's division of teacher education and licensure.

A motion was made by Jill Fox to accept the report, but not pursue this topic as an initiative for the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure for the 2001-02 school year. Ms. Brenda Duda seconded the motion, and the motion carried unanimously.

Agenda Item C:

First Review of the Use of Updated Vocational Education Praxis II Assessments

Mr. Paul Joseph presented the first review of the use of updated vocational education Praxis II assessments. He reminded advisory board members that they received a report on the updated vocational education assessments at the September 17, 2001, meeting. The Educational Testing Service revised the following Praxis II vocational tests:

Marketing Education
Business Education
Technology Education
Family and Consumer Sciences

The Educational Testing Service reviewed and revised these tests and has no plans to develop new tests for these areas. The process of updating test items was supported by a Virginia committee of educators in career and technical education reviewing the assessments. The Virginia committee had determined that the tests were appropriate but certain test items were outdated.

Paul Joseph reported that Neils Brooks, Director of Career and Technical Education, Department of Education, was apprised of the revised assessments, and he supported the continued use of these Praxis II tests.

Department of Education staff recommended that the advisory board receive for first review a recommendation to approve the forms of the vocational education Praxis II tests for a period of two years (September 2001 to September 2003), with the qualifying scores established by the Board of Education in 1999.

Ms. Mary McCauley made a motion that first review be waived and that the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure accept the staff's recommendation. Dr. Jill Fox seconded the motion, and the motion was approved unanimously.

Agenda Item D:

General Assembly/Board of Education New Requirements for Approved Programs

Ms. Byrd Latham presented the General Assembly/Board of Education New Requirements for Approved Programs. She indicated that an annual data report of candidates completing teacher preparation programs in Virginia will be presented to the advisory board and the Board of Education beginning in May 2002. The report also will summarize major initiatives and significant changes that have occurred in programs during the year.

In 1995, the Standards of Learning (SOL) that set standards for K-12 learning were adopted. The revisions to the licensure regulations that followed the adoption of the SOL established competencies for the teacher preparation programs and reduced the number of teaching endorsement areas to 58. In May of 2000, the colleges submitted matrices verifying that their programs were in line with the SOL and the licensure competencies.

In 2001, the revised Regulations Governing Approved Programs For Virginia Institutions of Higher Education were adopted. The Title II Advisory Panel was expanded to become the Title II and Teacher Education Advisory Panel. The Panel will provide feedback on the development of the guidelines to assist with

the implementation of the approved program standards. The panel held its first meeting November 13 and proposed the following guidelines:

1. Colleges will have a five-year review cycle. (They must report every five years on how they are meeting the standards.)
2. Trained teams will conduct an on-sight review to determine if the standards are being met.
3. Standards address program design, candidate performance, technology, and operational resources.
4. The annual report to the Department of Education will be aligned with Title II reporting requirements, State Council of Higher Education for Virginia reports, and AACTE/NCATE annual reports.
5. Standards require a 70 percent pass rate of Praxis II content assessments.

Prior to the initial on-site review, the institution will submit the information required in the Conditions for Qualifying and then develop a report showing how the 20 standards are addressed and information on programs that meet the 70 percent pass rate on the Praxis II assessment. If there is no Praxis that relates to a particular program area, or if the score in a particular area falls below 70 percent, additional information will be provided. If the 70 percent pass rate is achieved, additional program information is not required. If programs do not meet 70 percent, the institution has two years to raise the scores before approval of the program is in jeopardy.

The team that goes on-sight to review a program will consist of a chair (appointed jointly by the Department of Education and the college or university). The team will consist of three to five people appointed by the Department of Education. A review takes about two and a half days. The on-site review team will prepare a report of their findings with a recommendation for program approval, approval with stipulations, or denial. The institution has a chance to make changes in the report if there are factual errors (numbers or data). The recommendations from the review team are submitted to ABTEL. ABTEL will review the report and submit their recommendations to the Board of Education. The final decision is the responsibility of the Board of Education.

Programs recommended for approval with stipulations also will be designated as at-risk of being identified as a low-performing program. If that happens the institution has three years to correct inadequacies. Programs that are denied will also be identified as low-performing for the purposes of the Title II legislation.

The General Assembly in 1999, in its quality enhancement act, directed that the Board of Education would establish a new system for the accreditation and review of institutions and that that system would become effective July 1, 2002.

Some Virginia institutions are considering accreditation by the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC) which is still seeking national recognition as an accrediting agency. If TEAC is officially recognized, ABTEL may want to develop a recommendation to the Board that TEAC be an accreditation option for Virginia programs. Currently, NCATE and the Board of Education are the two options in Virginia.

Agenda Item E:

New Licensure Regulations for School Personnel Expanding the Career Switcher Program to all Careers and Guidelines for Institutions of Higher Education, School Divisions, and Private Contractors to Implement the Regulations

Dr. Winston Odom presented the amendments to the Licensure Regulations for School Personnel expanding the career switcher program to all careers and the guidelines for institutions of higher education, school divisions, and private contractors to implement the regulations. The proposed amendments to the regulations will be presented to the Board of Education on November 27, 2001. If the amendments to the regulations are approved by the board, they will be subject to a 30-day comment period. The anticipated effective date is December 27, 2001. The proposed licensure regulations may be accessed on the Department of Education's Web site (www.pen.k12.va.us).

The amendments to the licensure regulations include the following:

- As part of the prerequisite requirements for a person entering the career switcher program, the individual must have at least five years of work experience or the equivalent.
- A program provider will be permitted to conduct phase I training for up to one year so this preparation is not limited to only the summer or a four or five-week period). Program providers will have the option of providing this preparation on weeknights and weekends.
- The Department of Education will certify the program provider for the first year.

The state funding provided during the two-year pilot by the General Assembly will end at the conclusion of level II preparation for the second cohort group. However, funding has been requested of the 2001 General Assembly and if approved, the funds will be used for scholarships with the recommendation that only individuals in critical shortage areas receive scholarships.

As part of the proposed regulation changes, institutions of higher education, school divisions, and private contractors will be able to make application to conduct a career switcher program. Program providers, with the new regulations, can set their own fee.

The proposed amendments to the regulations require a review of the program by the Department of Education at the end of that first year. Once it is conducted and approval is granted, then the program provider is certified for the next five years. The program must provide an annual report to the Department of Education. A longitudinal study will be conducted to follow-up on the performance of graduates of career switcher programs.

Dr. Elliott informed the advisory board that the program, **Speaking of Education: Teaching in Virginia**, was televised on Channel 23 on November 18. The program highlighted three teachers – a teacher prepared through a traditional teacher preparation program (Teacher of the Year, Ruth Grillo); a graduate of the career switcher program; and a teacher completing the technical professional licensure route.

Agenda Item F:

A Report on the Impact of the Commonwealth Special Education Endorsement Program on the Supply of Special Educators in Virginia

Dr. Pat Burgess presented a report on the impact of the Commonwealth Special Education Endorsement Program on the Supply of Special Educators in Virginia. Through a grant funded by the Virginia Department of Education, Old Dominion University initiated a distance learning endorsement program for special educators teaching in the Commonwealth of Virginia. A network has been developed among school divisions, state operated programs, private special education schools, the Virginia Department of Education, and Old Dominion University in order to provide site-based college courses in special education. These courses are designed to meet the requirements for endorsement in emotional disturbance, learning disabilities, and mental retardation.

The purpose of the program is to alleviate critical shortages in special education by preparing qualified special educators. Currently, a waiting list of teachers who

want to enroll in the program exists. Last year, Old Dominion University (ODU) requested and received an additional \$225,000. These funds allowed ODU to add 119 additional participants.

Evaluation is a component of the program. Mentors of the teachers are asked to complete a survey regarding teacher quality and knowledge and skills. Based on the mentor reports, teachers completing this program performed well in special education classrooms.

Jill Fox suggested that an evaluation or longitudinal follow-up study with principals would be beneficial to the decision making process for additional funding.

Agenda Item G:

A Report on the Use of the Local Eligibility License for the 2001-02 School Year

Mrs. Patty Pitts presented a report on the use of the local eligibility license for the 2001-02 year. The *Code of Virginia* requires school boards to provide the Board of Education information about teachers receiving local eligibility licenses and other data related to the issuance of local eligibility licenses as prescribed by the Board. Highlights of the responses to the 2001-02 survey, including comparisons with the 2000-01 survey results, are as follows:

- The response rate to the survey on local school board eligibility license was 100 percent.
- Of 132 Virginia school divisions, 85 school divisions (compared to 91 in 2000-01) reported that no local eligibility licenses were issued by their school boards.
- Forty-seven (47) school boards issued a total of 321 local eligibility licenses (compared to 234 in 2000-01).
- Of the 321 local eligibility licenses issued, 219 were issued to individuals who had previously held a three-year provisional license. Of the 219 who had previously held a three-year provisional license, 192 needed to complete the Praxis assessment requirement.

- In 2001-02, the teaching areas in which most eligibility licenses were issued are as follows:

Teaching Area	Number of Licenses Issued 2001-02
Early/primary and Elementary Education	94
English	29
Mathematics	26
English as Second Lang.	17
Foreign Lang.-Spanish	16
Earth science	16
Health and Physical Educ.	14
Middle Education	14
History and Social Studies	13

The Board of Education will receive the report during their meeting on November 27.

Agenda Item H:

A Progress Report on Plans to Conduct Matching, Validation, and Standard-Setting Studies for Special Education Praxis II Assessments

Mr. Paul Joseph presented a progress report on plans to conduct matching, validation, and standard-setting studies for special education Praxis II assessments. The Educational Testing Service has developed new assessments in special education. Currently, three new special education tests have been completed. They are as follows:

0353 Education of Exceptional Students: Core Content Knowledge

0382 EES: Learning Disabilities

0542 EES: Mild to Moderate Disabilities

The following additional tests are under development by the Educational Testing Service:

0322 EES: Education of Exceptional Students: MR
(estimated availability date: June 2002)

0372 EES: Emotional and Behavioral Disorders
(estimated availability date: June 2002)

EES: Orthopedic Impairments

EES: Visual Impairments

EES: Preschool/Early Childhood

The advisory board discussed possible options in the use of the special education assessments and the timeline for conducting the matching, validation, and standard-setting studies. Options discussed included requiring only the core content knowledge assessment for special educators; requiring the core content knowledge assessment as well as an assessment in the categorical special education area; and requiring the core content knowledge assessment for initial licensure and using the specific categorical special education test for individuals with one area of special education seeking to add a second special education endorsement. Mr. Joseph indicated that based on informal conversations that the Department staff had with some college and university deans and officials about these tests, the overwhelming position supported waiting until all tests are developed and reviewed before a decision is made on what tests would be recommended for use in Virginia.

A motion was made by Dr. David Smith to wait until all the tests in the mild moderate area are available before any decision on what tests will be required was made. Dr. Mark Glaser seconded the motion, and the motion was approved unanimously.

Agenda Item I:

Report on Amendments to the Regulations Governing the Employment of Professional Personnel

Dr. Thomas Elliott presented a report on the amendments to the Regulations Governing the Employment of Professional Personnel. He recommended that advisory board members share with teachers and other instructional personnel the content of the *Regulations Governing the Employment of Professional Personnel*.

The only significant change proposed in the Regulations Governing the Employment of Professional Personnel regards Board of Education action when a breach of contract occurs.

LIAISON REPORTS

Virginia Community College System (VCCS)

Dr. Carole Ballard did not present a report during the meeting, but she will have a report from the Virginia Community College System at the January 2002 meeting.

State Council of Higher Education for Virginia (SCHEV)

Dr. Karl Schilling, State Council of Higher Education for Virginia, was not present; therefore, a report was not provided at this meeting.

Virginia Department of Education (DOE)

Dr. Thomas A. Elliott presented the Virginia Department of Education liaison report, and he shared the following items:

- Ms. Ruth S. Grillo, was named the 2002 Virginia Teacher of the Year on October 26, 2001, at a banquet held at the Virginia Museum of Fine Arts in Richmond.
- On November 26, 2001, Title II reports from the 50 states should be available at the following Web site: www.title2.org.
- The Joint Task Force on the K-12 Teaching Profession for Virginia was presented to the Board of Education and State Council of Higher Education for Virginia in June 2001. On November 27, Board of Education Member, Susan Genovese, will present a revised report and a recommended list of individuals to serve on a committee to implement the recommendations of the task force report. The committee will consist of business representatives, members of the General Assembly, teachers, and others.
- Virginia National Board Certified Teachers have been notified in writing of the prorated amount they will receive for initial and continuing awards. The General Assembly did not fund the full incentive awards -- \$5,000 initial awards and \$2,500 continuing awards. The prorated amounts National Board

Certified teachers will receive are as follows: initial award of approximately \$1,600 and continuing awards of approximately \$800.

- The Milken Family Foundation will recognize four outstanding educators at a banquet on December 6 held during the Teacher as Leader Forum on December 6-7, 2001. The forum will be held at the Sheraton West Richmond Hotel. Invitations were extended to Virginia exemplary educators (National Board Certified Teachers, Virginia Teachers of the Year, National Teachers of the Year, Regional Teachers of the Year, Christa McAuliffe Fellows, Mathematics and Science Scholars, Disney Teachers, and others) throughout the state. Dr. Elliott extended the invitation to all advisory board members to attend the forum and banquet.
- A spring gala is being planned for exemplary teachers at James Madison University in April 2002.

INFORMATIONAL ITEM

The advisory board members congratulated Dr. J. David Smith who will be the new Provost at the University of Virginia College at Wise effective June 2002.

ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Mary McCauley to adjourn the meeting. Susan Walton seconded the motion, and the motion was approved unanimously.

The Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure meeting adjourned at 3:05 p.m.